DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 783 PS 019 163

AUTHOR Morgan, Gwen
TITLE Model State Efforts.
PUB DATE 23 Oct 90
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Conference on Preparation and Professional Development Programs for Early Childhood Educators: Emerging Needs for the Next Decade (New York, NY, November 7-8, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Ladders; Certification; *Child Caregivers; Course Content; Early Childhood Education; *Employers; *Models; Postsecondary Education; Private Sector; Profiles; Program Descriptions; *State Programs; *Training
IDENTIFIERS *Business Role

ABSTRACT

Models of state involvement in training child care providers are briefly discussed and the employers' role in training is explored. Six criteria for states that are taken as models are identified, and four are described. Various state activities are described for each criterion. It is noted that little is known about employer and other private sector involvement in caregiver training. Some of the major employer efforts of interest, including those of the United Way of Boston, California's Bank of America and the California R&R network, Mervyn's, Target Stores, American Express, Work/Family Directions for IBM, AT&T, and a taskforce of 30 companies in Rochester, New York, are discussed. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Gwen Morgan
Wheelock College
October 23, 1990

ED332783

MODEL STATE EFFORTS

Training has not been a priority in states, so that commitment has been sporadic. Training budgets appear to be the first to be cut in hard times. There is little systematic information available on what the states are doing. Models of interest, in this quick overview, are:

- states that contribute to a career ladder approach in their staff qualification requirements

- states that have early childhood teacher certification that includes coursework in child development and substantial practica with children younger than kindergarten

- states that are beginning to key on a role that is the bridge between Department of Education certification and licensing qualifications

- states that commit state and federal funds for training, that address different levels of training, i.e. basic orientation for entry, apprentice level; training for competence; training for those already competent who aspire to further professional growth; encouragement of college professional education through scholarships; loan forgiveness.

- states that reward programs or providers with higher reimbursement for more training, or salary enhancement schemes linked to training

- states that use training to bring together the three streams of early childhood programs: Head Start, schools, and the purchase of service system, in better collaboration.

Having established these criteria of policy interest, it is clear that there is not adequate systematic information available to identify state models of interest. The following is therefore a small amount of information, some of it sketchy and anecdotal, in order to stimulate discussion that might augment these models. Most of the information below was gathered by the author's ongoing study of state licensing policies. Some of the information on training and other incentives is derived from the Children's Defense Fund's recent publication State Practices Regarding the Quality of Child Care.

PS 019163

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gwen G. Morgan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Carnegie Corporation
OCT 26 1990
Answered | Recorded
Staff:
Date:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- states that contribute to a career ladder approach in their staff qualification requirements

Eleven states spell out two levels of caregivers in their licensing requirements for early care and education programs. A second level of teacher must be more highly qualified than the other teachers, and is called a "lead teacher", or other such title. The purpose of these requirements is to assure that every center has at least one teacher qualified to be a role model or mentor for other teachers. A side effect of such a system is to establish a potential model of career development, since the "lead" teachers might enter with pre-service qualifications or might move up from the teacher level with college training acquired while employed.

A growing number of states have added ongoing annual training requirements to their licensing rules, both for centers and family day care. Thirty-nine states have annual ongoing training requirements for staff in early care and education programs. Sixteen states require ongoing training for family day care.

Very few states spell out the content of the ongoing training to assure that over the years there will be no duplication, and an increased breadth. Hawaii, interestingly, has content areas that family day care providers must use in their ongoing training, submitting evidence of training in a new content area each year. Massachusetts has extensive requirements for the distribution of content in its pre-service qualifying training, and to the extent that the ongoing training is used to pre-qualify a person to move up to another role, these distribution requirements will be used.

The amount of ongoing training varies from very extensive in Wisconsin, to very little in Nevada. The intent of these ongoing training requirements has been to improve quality, and to equip staff to be more competent in the role they are in. However, if the ongoing training is high quality, college credit training, it can also have the effect of equipping staff for upward advancement into more responsible roles. Ongoing training in one role is also pre-service training for the next role, if there is a role progression concept in either the licensing requirements or in the policies established by directors and/or unions.

- states that have early childhood teacher certification that includes coursework in child development and substantial practica with children younger than kindergarten

While there appears to be a renaissance of interest in developmentally appropriate teaching of young children, it is not clear that this interest has inspired state education systems to implement new teacher certificates. At least one state, New Jersey, has dropped its early childhood certificate. Seven states have a certificate limited to children younger than six. Eighteen states have certificates for teaching children at least as young as three, up to children no older than nine. Fourteen states have early childhood endorsements to elementary education teaching certificates. Details about the requirements of these certificates are not readily available. For many, a practicum in an "inappropriate" kindergarten classroom is acceptable.

- states that are beginning to key on a role that is the bridge between Department of Education certification and licensing qualifications

Information is not available on the number of states in which there are task forces, or interagency discussions that identify the relationship between licensing requirements for staff qualifications and teacher certification in education departments. In Massachusetts, such discussions have been going on for the past year, since the state changed its staff qualifications in both licensing and teacher certification at the same time. Massachusetts has a well developed career approach in licensing, and has set up a computerized process for granting licensing certification to staff members, qualifying them for roles as teacher, lead teacher, director of a small center, or director of a large center. Extensive college participation was involved in establishing the coursework/program requirements for each of these roles. At the same time, the Department of Education instituted three different sweeping reforms; (1) a teacher certificate for work with N-3 which requires practica with children younger than kindergarten and child development coursework; identification of this early childhood certificate as qualification for work with young children with special needs, in order to achieve mainstreaming; and teacher education reforms which require a liberal arts degree, mentoring with provisional status, and an advanced degree for all teachers.

The Department recognizes an Associate Teacher title, and the new reforms add other potential roles if fully implemented; provisional teacher, for example, and mentor.

Since there has been heavy early childhood professional involvement in the development of both systems, further discussion is taking place to identify the relationship between the two, and what the key roles are for equity in salaries in the future, given equal qualification of an individual. It seems clear that the lead teacher in the licensing schema, with professional college degrees either pre-service or while employed, is the bridging role to either the Associate Teacher, Provisional Teacher, or even Mentor, in the Education system, depending on qualifications. The two systems have cooperated in setting up training that included different levels of training geared to career progression.

These are ambitious plans in Massachusetts, and depend on the availability of qualified state staff, on some funds for mentors in education, and on training for meeting the licensing system's goals. Right now Massachusetts is being decimated by political disagreement over taxes, and its plans are seriously weakened by state cuts in staff, and elimination entirely of the state contribution to a training system that was geared to career progression. Some of the training remains in place with federal funds.
It may be that this type of discussion in under way in other states, but there is no systematic information available.

- states that commit state and federal funds for training, that address different levels of training, i.e. basic orientation for entry, apprentice level; training for competence; training for those already competent who aspire to further professional growth; encouragement of college professional education through scholarships; loan forgiveness.

As described above, Massachusetts had an extensive plan for training, that required cooperation between licensing and Education, that used both state and federal funds, and addressed different levels of training.

Delaware used state funds to develop a statewide comprehensive plan for training that includes the components identified above as of interest. The state has ongoing training requirements. The plan suggests that the in-service required ongoing training be developed in relation to a career approach, recognizing three levels in both the center and family day care systems: apprentice, competent practitioner, and master practitioner. The task force working on the plan identified as a major barrier the "brick wall" between pre-professional and professional training, and proposed to develop a bridging system in which the credits and work done at earlier levels can be "counted" when validated by tests, toward programs like the CDA and college degrees. The plan has just been published in the

state, and first steps toward implementing it are being made. It will require articulation agreements among the colleges, development of different levels of training. Although Delaware is clear that it will take ten years to fully implement its plan, it is possible for a small state to bring all the players together in a way that larger states cannot. Delaware may well become a model of great interest to other states.

North Carolina is a state with a longstanding interest in training, as a way of addressing quality issues when licensing requirements for ratios and staff qualifications are low. Wisconsin has a quality enhancement system under way that includes training. Both these states have experience with telecommunications training.

According to the report from CDF, states are spending $8 million on training in the early care and education field. Twenty-nine states had a commitment to training that could be estimated in dollars and described in effort. Sixteen of the 29 spent between $100,000 and $400,000. Much of this was state money, although states used a combination of federal dollars that support CDA (New York), the Social Services Block Grant, and the Dependent Care block grant. There are a variety of other sources of funds that are being used, available to Education and Health Departments as well as to social service agencies.JPTA funds are also being used.No study has yet ferreted out the entire effort. CDF comments, "While only a few states have attempted to address the full range of issues in a comprehensive way, the collective experience of states now provides a rich array of approaches to guide future training initiatives.

Professional training, as defined by NAEYC begins with the CDA certificate. That program appears to be going the the direction of a pre-service qualifying credential, equivalent to roughly a year of college. However, its older model co-exists at present, with validation of in-service training and supervised experience through competency criteria.

Many geographic areas do not have either a CDA certificate program or an A.S. degree program in early care and education. Directors report that some of the B.S. programs are not producing staff with sufficient breadth of skills, and that turnover is highest in this group. (comments from Delaware and Massachusetts). State efforts have largely concentrated on the entry level (apprentice) and competency level. Here what appears to be important is that the training be delivered at convenient times in comfortable places. Entry level staff are not yet comfortable with college classrooms. In recent years, much of this training has been arranged or delivered through the

resource and referral agencies, that have a relationship with all programs.

- states that reward programs or providers with higher reimbursement for more training, or salary enhancement schemes linked to training

The CDF study indicated that 15 states indicated that they were trying to improve salaries, but it is not known the extent to which this effort is tied to training or qualifications.

Minnesota pay a higher rate for care in centers that are accredited by NAEYC, which is directly related to the use of qualified staff. It is not known how many other states have such incentives, or whether any state pays a higher rate for master practitioners in the family day care system.

- states that use training to bring together the three streams of early childhood programs: Head Start, schools, and the purchase of service system, in better collaboration.

Information on collaboration among the major funding streams is not readily available. More information, even anecdotal, would be useful on this interesting issue. In the City of Cambridge, research funds have been used through the school system to offer training to teachers in the schools, Head Start staff, staff in the purchase of service early care and education system, and parents. The result has been improved quality in all the systems, better transitions, and more collaboration.

EMPLOYER ROLE IN TRAINING

There is a scarcity of information on employer and other private sector involvement in training. Employer efforts are not fully known because some of the information is proprietary, and not yet available to researchers. Little is known about charitable private sector involvement in training, although it may be extensive. United Way in Boston, for example, is funding a Career Institute for the Boston area, that involves a number of colleges working together. There may be other such efforts. The following brief notes will concentrate on some of the major employer efforts of interest.

A well known example of employer involvement was the initiative developed in California under the leadership of the Bank of America and the California R&R network. A large number of employers, and the state of California, contributed to an effort to support local R&Rs in work to recruit and train new family day care providers, often in geographic areas where no recruitment had been done before. The initiative is now being exported to other states with foundation support. High quality training materials were developed as part of the iniative.

Mervyn's, a chain of retail stores associated with Dayton-Hudson, has been supporting training for family day care providers in selected cities. The project offered local communities a choice of 5 already-developed curricula, rather than encouraging proliferation of new inventions of the wheel. In the cities where Mervy's training has taken place, providers have shown themselves much more willing to participate in training that requires a commitment of substantial hours than was previously believed. The training also has enhanced the sense of professionalism among the provider participants. and resulted in stronger associations of providers.

Target Stores, another chain associated with Dayton-Hudson, has now joined the effort to expand the training available to family day care providers, and both sponsors are interested in better public relations material to support family day care. In geographic areas where initial competency training has already been available, Target will support Master Provider training. The Target and Mervyn's efforts are limited to selected cities, but the program is a substantial one that has a strong effect.

American Express has been involved in spending its charitable dollars strategically in geographic areas in which the service system affects their employees. Their

projects have been more diverse, and less centralized than the Mervyn's and Target projects, but are characterized by sophisticated understanding of the issues in the community in question, and tailoring to community needs. Some of these funds have been spent in training.

Employers have been much more extensively involved in recruiting and training family day cre than is generally known. Most of the well known efforts have spent companies' charitable dollars. However, direct business dollars are also being spent in substantial amounts to improve the day care system that is perceived by businesses to be linked to their workforce populations.

In 1982, Work/Family Directions began recruiting new family day care providers on behalf of their first client, IBM, in more than 200 cities. The organization has recruited roughly 10,000 new homes per year since that time, relying on local resource and referral agencies (R&Rs) to do the work. All subsequent clients of W/F D have added dollars to the effort to develop new family day care providers, so that now more than 50 companies are committing funds in more than 250 cities. Along with the recruitment has come basic training for new providers, which varies in depth from R&Rs that frequently visit and consult with providers to R&Rs that provide some initial training sessions.

In addition to this initial recruitment/orientation for new providers, IBM began offering training dollars to local communities, through the R&Rs, at the same time. In some communities, the amount offered was as little as $500, and in others it was up to $5000. The local communities responded enthusiastically. Some reported it was the first training money ever to be spent in their communities, and it was remarkable how much training and how creative the local R&Rs were able to be with the small amounts of money available in communities with few IBM employees. Training content had to be connected with needs identified through parent calls, and it tended to focus on expanding knowledge of infant care among centers, and on family day care competence, although the topics, left to the local communities to propose, varied widely.

In 1989, W/F D began using funds from its other clients to expand the training effort, which is now substantial. In addition, some of the training is now centrally developed and offered to local communities.

IBM is now engaged in a $25 million dependent care initiative over a five year period, $23 million of which is devoted to increasing the supply and improving the quality of early care and education programs in communities serving IBM employees. The Fund for Dependent Care Initiatives is administered by a new organization, Work/Family Directions

Development. Some of the training support will in the future be shared by funds from W/F D and W/F DD. Substantial new funds from the new initiative are available for training. These training funds are not available to local R&Rs to design their own training. Instead, the local community may select a "national" training intensive seminar that will be brought to their community.

Local college involvement is strongly encouraged, and the seminars carry course credit. One objective of the strategy is to influence the local college systems to devote more resources to the needs of the early care and education field; another is to disseminate some central themes in the field more rapidly. One of the central themes is the career development approach to staffing.

The first two of these intensive seminars have been offered in eight communities. One of them was a seminar for staff and directors in school-age programs, designed to improve quality in out-of-school programs; the other was a seminar in financial management for day care directors. In addition, a one-day training on health and safety for family day care providers was developed centrally and funded locally.

By next summer, the "national" seminars will permit the local communities to select from a wider range, including the above two seminars, plus seminars in infant programming, a seminar on staffing co-sponsored with the National Employees Project; a seminar for Master Providers in family day care; and others. Work/Family Directions will commit some of its training money to "national" seminars, reducing the amount spent on content developed by the local R&Rs.

IBM is also contributing indirectly to training by strong support for NAEYC accreditation. No center will receive any money or other support from IBM unless it agrees to become accredited.

AT&T also has a national initiative of $10 million to improve the quality and expand the supply of child care for its employees. The process has been highly decentralized, funding only projects suggested locally by AT&T employees. It is likely that some training projects have been or will be funded as part of this effort.

The business community understands the effectiveness and impact of high quality training, and it understands the need for career development. There is a strong potential for local business efforts in support of improving the early care and education system through training. A barrier is the fact that companies have not yet connected their efforts at improving public education, in which they clearly understand the importance of the preschool years, with their

efforts at improving early care and education programs serving their employees' needs. Once the connection is made that "child care" is a part of the infrastructure of the community contributing to later school success, companies will become more focused in their support of both goals.

In Rochester, New York, a task force of 30 companies was formed to examine the needs of the entire system of early care and education programs in their community. Participants in the task force, chaired by Al Bergeron from Kodak, were largely human resource staff in their own companies. As experts in personnel policies, they were instantly able to perceive the problems in the early care and education field: low-paying jobs perceived as dead-ended. As a result, an ambitious plan for solving these problems has evolved in Rochester, that includes a not-yet-funded Career Institute, joint benefits planning, a flying squad of role models to serve as substitutes when staff are given released time for training.

Rochester has not yet implemented its new $350,000 plan, but its development alone has been of value, and the beginning steps of implementation may influence other communities if fully publicized.